

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are presently pending in this case. Claims 1-7 and 9 are amended by the present amendment. Amended Claims 1-7 and 9 are supported by the original claims. Amended Claims 1-7 and 9 add no new matter.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-4, 6, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Curry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,582, hereinafter “Curry”) in view of Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,494, hereinafter “Krishnaswamy”). Claims 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Krishnaswamy.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Curry in view of Krishnaswamy, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites a method for providing a network environment comprising,
inter alia:

...
setting said closed network for each of said clients in the group requesting access to a closed network in response to the received request and informing said client of use permission based on a predetermined discriminator and an access priority;
and
managing a use time of said closed network for the group, said access priority representing a priority of the group, only member clients of the group being accessible to said closed network.

In paragraph 2 on page 2, the outstanding Office Action cited Curry as teaching “setting an individual network for each of said clients requesting to provide a closed network in response to the received request and informing to said client of use permission with a predetermined discriminator and an access priority” at column 5, lines 28-32 and column 12,

lines 16-19. However, it is respectfully submitted that neither section of Curry teaches or suggests "a predetermined discriminator" or "an access priority" as recited in Claim 1.

Column 5, lines 28-32 of Curry discusses the creation of a single communication link between a first and second telephony server. There is no discussion relating to multiple users, much less a teaching or suggestion for "informing said client of use permission based on a predetermined discriminator and an access priority," as recited in Claim 1.

Column 12, lines 16-19 of Curry discusses user access *permissions*, not access *priorities*. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of a predetermined discriminator. Accordingly, since Curry does not teach or suggest "informing said client of use permission based on a predetermined discriminator and an access priority," it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over Curry in view of Krishnaswamy.

Amended independent Claims 2-5 and 9 recite similar elements to Claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 2-5 and 9, and Claims 6-8 dependent therefrom, are patentable over any combination of Curry and Krishnaswamy for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Accordingly, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)